



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,762	02/23/2007	Ruben Laguna-Macias	P18914-US1	3853
27045	7590	09/11/2008		
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			EXAMINER RAHMAN, MOHAMMAD N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/599,762

Applicant(s)

LAGUNA-MACIAS ET AL.

Examiner

MOHAMMAD N. RAHMAN

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on June 17, 2008 has been entered. **Claims 16-23** have been amended. **Claims 1-32** are pending in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims to computer-related inventions that are clearly nonstatutory fall into the same general categories as nonstatutory claims in other arts, namely natural phenomena such as magnetism, and abstract ideas or laws of nature which constitute "descriptive material." Abstract ideas, Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759, or the mere manipulation of abstract ideas, Schrader, 22 F.3d at 292-93, 30 USPQ2d at 1457 58, are not patentable. Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." In this context, "functional descriptive material" consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (The definition of "data structure" is "a physical or logical relationship among data elements, designed to support specific data manipulation functions." The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms 308 (5th ed. 1993).) "Nonfunctional descriptive material" includes but is not limited to music, literary works and a compilation or mere arrangement of data (See MPEP section 2 106, IV, B, 1)

3. **Claims 16-32** are rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either “functional descriptive material” or “nonfunctional descriptive material.” Both types of “descriptive material” are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994)

Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because “[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.”)

Claim Rejection – 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. **Claims 1- 6, 9-12, 14, 16-22, 24-27 and 30-32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Blakley, III et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0128378), herein referred to as Blakley.

As to claim 1, Blakley teaches, "a method of handling user's attributes sharing between a plurality of Service Providers, a Service Provider being regarded as an Attribute Provider hosting at least one user's attribute for a user and offering such attribute for sharing with other Service Providers regarded as Attribute Requestors, an attribute offering being published in a Discovery Service Framework suitable for holding attribute offerings from at least one Attribute Provider and for providing any of such attribute offerings to at least one Attribute Requestor, the method comprising the steps of" (see at abstract, Paragraph [0087]) :

- "the Attribute Provider registering an offering registration trigger in the Discovery Service Framework intended to request, if needed, the registration of the attribute offering" at paragraphs [0047],[0068], [0077], [0080] and [0086];

(Blakley teaches, "the authentication is successful, an active session is established for the authenticated user or client" at Paragraph [0047] and "framework for exchanging security information" at paragraph[0068] and "framework for exchanging security information" at paragraph [0068] and "the user (40) might have accessed another service provider(30) and, after having been authenticated in this another service provider, the user

may invoke a service that, for its complete execution, needs a user's attribute that is hosted in an external Attribute provider (20). The another service provider (30) where the user has presently accessed, playing the role of an Attribute Requestor, requests (S-102) the location of the user's attribute to the DSF (10)" at paragraph [0077], thus in here, the Attribute Provider registration is equivalent to authentication of data which triggers the process for the requested attributes.)

- "the Attribute Provider receiving from the Discovery Service Framework a request for registration of the attribute offering" at paragraphs [0069], [0090], [0093] and [0099];

(Blakley teaches, "an attribute information provider may optionally present an interface for a user to create attribute release policies when a user registers for the attribute information service or when a user updates the user's attribute information" at paragraph [0090], "requested e-commerce service provider may optionally determine to use more than one attribute information provider whereby the e-commerce service provider requests a subset of user attributes from each of the multiple attribute information providers" at paragraph [0099], which

clearly interprets that the attribute provider receiving a request for registration of the corresponding attributes.)

- “the Attribute Provider registering an attribute offering in the Discovery Service Framework” at Paragraphs [0089] and [0092];

(Blakley teaches, “the user has registered with multiple attribute information providers, then one of those attribute information providers would be considered to be the user's attribute home domain” at Paragraph [0092], thus the attribute Provider registering an attribute to the service provider.)

- and “the Attribute Provider providing the attribute upon request from an Attribute Requestor” at Paragraph [0021], [0035], [0090] and [0099].

(Blakley teaches, “an attribute retrieval request message for the indicated attribute information provider”, at Paragraph [0099], thus the attribute Provider generating an attribute request from an Attribute Requestor.)

As to claim 2, Blakley teaches, the method of claim 1 wherein “the offering registration trigger is the same for all those users for which the Attribute Provider hosts users' attributes” at paragraphs [0046], [0047], [0048] and [0075].

As to claim 3, Blakley teaches, the method of claim 1 wherein “the offering registration trigger is different for each user having a user’s attribute hosted in the Attribute Provider” at paragraphs [0034],[0034] [0046], [0048], [0051] and [0049], .

As to claim 4, Blakley teaches, the method of claim 1 wherein “the step of registering an offering registration trigger in the Discovery Service Framework also includes a step of registering policies intended to govern the lifetime of the offering registration trigger” see at abstract, Paragraph [0020], , [0053] and [0170].

As to claim 5, Blakley teaches, the method of claim 1 wherein “the step of registering an attribute offering in the Discovery Service Framework also includes a step of registering policies intended to govern the lifetime of the attribute offering” at paragraphs [0060], [0047], [0090],[0094] ,[0097] and [0102] .

As to claim 6, Blakley teaches, the method of claim 1 further comprising “a step of obtaining a user’s consent to share a user’s attribute” at paragraphs [0058], [0103], [0174], [0107], [0157] and [0153].

As to claim 9, Blakley teaches, “a method of publishing through a Discovery Service Framework an attribute offering for sharing a user’s attribute between a plurality of Service Providers, a Service Provider being regarded as an Attribute Provider hosting the user’s attribute for which the attribute offering may be published, the Discovery Service Framework suitable for holding attribute offerings from at least one Attribute

Provider" (see at "abstract" and paragraphs [0061], and [0087]) , the method comprising the steps of:

- "registering an offering registration trigger in the Discovery Service Framework upon request from the Attribute Provider" at paragraphs [0068] ,[0086], [0047], [0074], [0076], [0099] and [0075];

(Blakley teaches, "a user is registered may be considered to be the user's home domain within the federated computing environment" at Paragraph [0076], and "the ability to generate and validate authentication credentials for a user" at Paragraph [0076], and "generates an attribute retrieval request message for the indicated attribute information provider" at paragraph [0099], and "the authentication is successful, an active session is established for the authenticated user or client." at paragraph [0047], and "framework for exchanging security information" at Paragraph [0068], thus, the request from the attribute provider triggers the registration procedure.)

- "the Discovery Service Framework processing the offering registration trigger upon request for an attribute offering received from an Attribute Requestor" at paragraphs [0068], [0069], [0086], [0047],[0074], [0076], [0099] [0110] and

[0140].

(Blakley teaches, "the e-commerce service provider has received and examined an attribute retrieval request message from an attribute information provider" at paragraph [0110], "submitted registration information" at paragraph [0047], since, the service provider being processing the registration procedure upon receiving the attribute request".)

- "requesting the registration of the attribute offering to the Attribute Provider as a result of processing the offering registration trigger" at Paragraphs [0080], and [0089] ;

(Blakley teaches, "establishment of a trust relationship between a user and a service provider may be equivalent to a registration process" at paragraph [0080], "the user registers or subscribes with an attribute information provider that stores, maintains, and releases the user's attribute information" at paragraph [0089], thus the result of the registration procedure is produce by the attribute provider.)

- "registering in the Discovery Service Framework an attribute offering upon request from an Attribute Provider" at paragraphs [0068] ,[0086], [0047],[0074], [0076], [0099] and [0075];

(Blakley teaches, "a user is registered may be considered to be the user's home domain within the federated computing environment" at paragraph [0076], "the ability to generate and validate authentication credentials for a user" at Paragraph [0076], "generates an attribute retrieval request message for the indicated attribute information provider" at paragraph [0099], the authentication is successful, an active session is established for the authenticated user or client." At paragraph [0047], framework for exchanging security information" at paragraph [0068], thus, to registering an attributes, a request is being made by the service provider.)

- "the Discovery Service Framework providing the attribute offering upon request from a Service Provider acting as an Attribute Requestor for the attribute offering" at paragraphs [0021] and [0034].

(Blakley teaches, "an attribute information provider generates a response message to be sent to an e-commerce service provider that has requested the retrieval of attributes for a particular user" at Paragraph [0034], thus the request for the attribute registration is made by a service provider.)

As to claim 10, Blakley teaches, the method of claim 9 wherein "the step of registering an offering registration trigger in the Discovery Service Framework also includes a step of registering policies intended to govern the lifetime of the offering registration trigger" at paragraphs [0060], [0047], [0090],[0094] ,[0097] and [0102] .

As to claim 11, Blakley teaches, the method of claim 9 wherein "the step of registering an attribute offering in the Discovery Service Framework also includes a step of registering policies intended to govern the lifetime of the attribute offering" see at abstract, paragraphs [0020], [0053] and [0170].

As to claim 12, Blakley teaches, the method of claim 9 wherein "the offering registration trigger is withdrawn upon processing corresponding policies governing its lifetime" at paragraphs [0084], [0044], [0020], [0053] and [0170].

As to claim 14, Blakley teaches, the method of claim 9 wherein just the attribute offering, and not the offering registration trigger, is withdrawn upon processing corresponding policies governing its lifetime" at paragraphs [0084], [0044], [0020], [0053] and [0170].

As to claim 16, blakley teaches, a system for utilizing an attribute, the system comprising:

- “a Discovery Service Framework suitable for holding an attribute offering”, see at “abstract” and paragraphs [0050], and [0086];
- “an Attribute Provider, wherein the attribute offering is registered from the Attribute Provider” at paragraphs [0047],[0068], [0077], [0080] and [0086] (since the authentication is same as registering attributes;
- “an Attribute Requestor; wherein the Attribute Provider provides the attribute offering to the Attribute Requestor and the Attribute Provider and the Attribute Requestor are Service Providers enabled for sharing a user’s attribute, the Attribute Provider hosting the user’s attribute to be shared”, see at “abstract” and Paragraphs [0077] and [0087];

wherein the Discovery Service Framework includes:

- “a first input unit for processing an attribute offering received from an Attribute Provider” at paragraphs [0035],[0041], [0069], [0136] and [0149];
(Blakley teaches, “received as input in requests, in creating their responses. Thus, while clients always consume assertions, SAML authorities can be both producers and consumers of assertions” at paragraph [0069], thus it described that the input unit processes an attribute that is being requested by the attribute provider.)
- “a storage for storing contents obtainable from the attribute offering” at paragraph [0038], [0081], [0097] and [0104];

(Blakley teaches, “attribute storage locations and

then retrieve the user's attribute information when necessary" at paragraph [0081], thus a storage is maintained to store the contents which is offered from the attribute.)

- "a second input unit for processing a request received from an Attribute Requestor for the attribute offering" at paragraphs [0035], [0069], [0136] and [0149];

(Blakley teaches, "received as input in requests, in creating their responses. Thus, while clients always consume assertions, SAML authorities can be both producers and consumers of assertions" at paragraph [0069, thus the multiple input unit processes the attribute requests.)

- "a first output unit for providing the attribute offering to the Attribute Requestor" at paragraphs [0041] and [0140].

(Blakley teaches, "input/output adapter 128, which supports various I/O devices" at paragraph [0041] and "the attribute information provider constructs and returns a response message to an e-commerce service provider "at paragraph [0139] and "the attribute information provider may return various status codes that indicate a range of success in obtaining the requested attributes" at paragraph

[0140], since an output unit provides information according to the attribute request.)

- a third input unit for processing an offering registration trigger received from the Attribute Provider” at paragraphs [0035],[0041], [0069], [0136], [0140] and [0149];

(Blakley teaches, “received as input in requests, in creating their responses. Thus, while clients always consume assertions, SAML authorities can be both producers and consumers of assertions” at paragraph [0069], thus the multiple input unit processes the attribute requests.)

- “a trigger handler for storing contents obtainable from the offering registration trigger and for determining trigger conditions to request a registration of the attribute offering at paragraphs [0076], [0099], [0139], [0140] and [0142].

(Blakley teaches, “generate a response message that returns only some of the attributes that have been requested by an e-commerce service provider” at paragraph [0142], “a positive response message is generated at step 820 only if the attribute information provider has all of the requested attributes and only if the attribute information provider can release all of the requested attributes” at paragraph [0139])

- a second output unit for requesting the registration of the attribute offering to the Attribute Provider. at paragraphs [0041], [0035],[0041], [0069], [0136], [0140] and [0149];

(Blakley teaches, "input/output adapter 128, which supports various I/O devices" at paragraph [0041] and "received as input in requests, in creating their responses. Thus, while clients always consume assertions, SAML authorities can be both producers and consumers of assertions" at paragraph [0069], thus the multiple output unit processes the attribute requests.)

As to claim 17, Blakley teaches, system of claim 16 wherein "the trigger handler determines the trigger conditions upon reception in the second input unit of the request for the attribute offering from the Attribute Requestor" at paragraphs [0076], [0099], [0139]; and [0142].

As to claim 18, Blakley teaches, the system of claim 16 wherein "the trigger handler is usable for processing policies received in the third input unit and intended to govern the lifetime of the offering registration trigger" at paragraphs [0060], [0047], [0090],[0094] ,[0097] and [0102].

As to claim 19, Blakley teaches, "system of claim 18 wherein the trigger handler is usable to withdraw an offering registration trigger upon processing corresponding policies governing its lifetime" at paragraphs [0084], [0044], [0020], [0053] and [0170].

As to claim 21, Blakley teaches, system of claim 16 wherein "the trigger handler is usable for processing policies received in the first input unit and intended to govern the lifetime of the attribute offering" at paragraphs [0035], [0041], [0069], [0136], [0149], [0060], [0047], [0090], [0094], [0097] and [0102].

As to claim 22, Blakley teaches, the system of claim 21 wherein the trigger handler is usable to withdraw an attribute offering upon processing corresponding policies governing its lifetime" at paragraphs [0084], [0044], [0020], [0053] and [0170].

As to claim 24, Blakley teaches, "an Attribute Provider hosting a user's attribute for a user and offering such attribute for sharing with other Service Providers regarded as Attribute Requestors, an attribute offering for the user's attribute being published in a Discovery Service Framework suitable for holding attribute offerings from Attribute Providers and for providing any of such attribute offerings to Attribute Requestors, the Attribute Provider comprising:

- "a first output unit for accessing the Discovery Service Framework to register an attribute offering" at paragraph [0041],

(Blakley teaches, "input/output adapter 128, which

supports various I/O devices" at paragraph [0041], thus the multiple output unit processes the attribute requests.)

- "a first input unit for processing a request received from an Attribute Requestor for the attribute offering" at paragraphs [0035], [0069], [0136] and [0149];

(Blakley teaches, "received as input in requests, in creating their responses. Thus, while clients always consume assertions, SAML authorities can be both producers and consumers of assertions" at paragraph [0069], thus the multiple input unit processes the attribute requests.)

- a second output unit for providing the attribute offering to the Attribute Requestor" at paragraph [0041],

(Blakley teaches, "input/output adapter 128, which supports various I/O devices" at paragraph [0041], thus the multiple output unit processes the attribute requests.)

- a third output unit for accessing the Discovery Service Framework to register an offering registration trigger at paragraph [0041], [0047],[0068], [0075], [0080] and [0086];

("the authentication is successful, an active session is established for the authenticated user or client" at Paragraph [0047], "framework for exchanging security information" at Paragraph[0068], "output system" at

paragraph [0041], "output system" at paragraph [0041])

- and "a second input unit for processing a request received from the Discovery Service Framework for registration of an attribute offering" at paragraphs [0041], [0047], [0068], [0075], [0080] and [0086];

("the authentication is successful, an active session is established for the authenticated user or client" at Paragraph [0047], "framework for exchanging security information" at Paragraph [0068], "input/output adapter 128, which supports various I/O devices" at paragraph [0041], thus the multiple output unit processes the attribute requests)

As to claim 25, blakley teaches, the Attribute Provider of claim 24 wherein "the third output unit is used for accessing the Discovery Service Framework to register policies intended to govern the lifetime of the offering registration trigger" at paragraphs [0035],[0041], [0069], [0136] ,[0149], [0060], [0047], [0090],[0094] ,[0097] and [0102]

As to claim 26, blakley teaches, the Attribute Provider of claim 24 wherein the first output unit is used for accessing the Discovery Service Framework to register policies intended to govern the lifetime of the attribute offering" at paragraphs [0035],[0041], [0069], [0136] ,[0149], [0060], [0047], [0090],[0094] ,[0097] , [0157] and [0102]

As to claim 27, blakley teaches , the Attribute Provider of claim 24 further comprising: a fourth output unit for requesting a user's consent to share a user's attribute; and a third input unit for obtaining the user's consent to share a user's attribute" at Paragraphs [0058], [0103],[0174] [0107], [0157] and [0153].

As to claim 30, blakley teaches , the Attribute Provider of claim 24 wherein the third output unit is used to register in the Discovery Service Framework a same offering registration trigger for all those users for which the Attribute Provider hosts users' attributes" at paragraphs [0046], [0047], [0048] and [0075].

As to claim 31, blakley teaches , The Attribute Provider of claim 24 wherein "the third output unit is used to register in the Discovery Service Framework a different offering registration trigger for each user having a user's attribute hosted in the Attribute Provider" at paragraphs [0034],[0034] , [0041],[0046], [0048], [0051] and [0049], .

As to claim 32, Blakley teaches, the Attribute Provider of claim 24 wherein "the third and first output units are used to register the offering registration trigger along with an actual attribute offering" at paragraphs [0034],[0034] , [0041],[0046], [0048], [0051], [0158] and [0049], .

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 7, 8, 13, 15, 20, 23, 28 and 29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakley et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0128378 A1) as applied to **claims 1, 9 16 and 24** above, and further in view of Underwood (US Patent No. 6,633,878 B1), here in referred to as Underwood.

Regarding claim 7, which is depends on claims 1, **Blakley** discloses the claims invention as "A method of handling user's attributes sharing between a plurality of Service Providers, a Service Provider being regarded as an Attribute Provider hosting at least one user's attribute for a user and offering such attribute for sharing with other Service Providers regarded as Attribute Requestors, an attribute offering being published in a Discovery Service Framework suitable for holding attribute offerings from at least one Attribute Provider and for providing any of such attribute offerings to at least one Attribute Requestor, the method comprising the steps of: the Attribute Provider registering an offering registration trigger in the Discovery Service Framework intended to request, if needed, the registration of the attribute offering; the Attribute Provider receiving from the Discovery Service Framework a request for registration of the attribute offering; the Attribute Provider registering an attribute offering in the Discovery Service Framework; and the Attribute Provider providing the attribute upon request from

an Attribute Requestor", see at "abstract", paragraph [0087], [0069], [0090], [0093], [0021], [0035], [0090], [0099] and [0099]; :

Blakley does not appear to explicitly disclose for "the attribute offering, and not the offering registration trigger, is withdrawn once the user signs off".

However, Underwood teaches, "the attribute offering, and not the offering registration trigger, is withdrawn once the user signs off" at col.76, lines 55-61, col.77, lines 33-65, and col.312 , lines 22-33 .

(Underwood teaches, "sign-off serves as a final quality checkpoint that the work on the change request meets the business needs of the change requester," at col.77, lines 44-47, therefore, it is clearly said that the sign- off withdraws the triggering event and attribute offering.)

Blakley and Underwood are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of data processing system and e-commerce database framework..

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of **Blakley** and Underwood before him or her, to modify

the attribute offering, and not the offering registration trigger, is withdrawn once the user signs off

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to be a sign-off checkbox is checked or unchecked, the current user's ID and the current date may be captured by the Change Tracking tool at col. 77, lines 33-65.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine **Blakley** with Underwood to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Regarding claims 8, which is depends on claims 1, **Blakley** discloses the claim invention as "A method of handling user's attributes sharing between a plurality of Service Providers, a Service Provider being regarded as an Attribute Provider hosting at least one user's attribute for a user and offering such attribute for sharing with other Service Providers regarded as Attribute Requestors, an attribute offering being published in a Discovery Service Framework suitable for holding attribute offerings from at least one Attribute Provider and for providing any of such attribute offerings to at least one Attribute Requestor, the method comprising the steps of: the Attribute Provider registering an offering registration trigger in the Discovery Service Framework intended to request, if needed, the registration of the attribute offering; the Attribute Provider receiving from the Discovery Service Framework a request for registration of the attribute offering; the Attribute Provider registering an attribute offering in the Discovery Service Framework; and the Attribute Provider providing the attribute upon request from

an Attribute Requestor", see at "abstract", and paragraphs [0087], [0069], [0090], [0093], [0021], [0035], [0090], [0099], and [0099];

Blakley does not appear to explicitly disclose for "the offering registration trigger is withdrawn once the user signs off".

However, Underwood teaches, "the offering registration trigger is withdrawn once the user signs off" at col.76, lines 55-61, col.77, lines 33-65, col.312, lines 22-33 .

(Underwood teaches, "sign-off serves as a final quality checkpoint that the work on the change request meets the business needs of the change requester," at col.77, lines 44-47, therefore, it is clearly said to that sign- off withdraws the triggering event.)

Blakley and **Underwood** are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of data processing system and e-commerce database framework..

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of **Blakley** and Underwood before him or her; to modify the offering registration trigger is withdrawn once the user signs off.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to be a sign-off checkbox is checked or unchecked, the current user's ID and the current date may be captured by the Change Tracking tool at col. 77, lines 33-65.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine **Blakley** with Underwood to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Regarding claim 13, which is depends on claim 9, **Blakley** discloses the claim invention as "A method of publishing through a Discovery Service Framework an attribute offering for sharing a user's attribute between a plurality of Service Providers, a Service Provider being regarded as an Attribute Provider hosting the user's attribute for which the attribute offering may be published, the Discovery Service Framework suitable for holding attribute offerings from at least one Attribute Provider, the method comprising the steps of: registering an offering registration trigger in the Discovery Service Framework upon request from the Attribute Provider; the Discovery Service Framework processing the offering registration trigger upon request for an attribute offering received from an Attribute Requestor; requesting the registration of the attribute offering to the Attribute Provider as a result of processing the offering registration trigger; registering in the Discovery Service Framework an attribute offering upon request from an Attribute Provider; and the Discovery Service Framework providing the attribute offering upon request from a Service Provider acting as an Attribute Requestor for the attribute offering, Paragraph [0087], [0069], [0090], [0093], [0021], [0035], [0090] and [0099] and [0099]; :

Blakley does not appear to explicitly disclose for "the offering registration trigger is withdrawn upon request from the Attribute Provider where the user signs off".

However, Underwood teaches, "the offering registration trigger is withdrawn upon request from the Attribute Provider where the user signs off" at col.76, lines 55-61, col.77, lines 33-65, col.312, lines 22-33 .

(Underwood teaches, "sign-off serves as a final quality checkpoint that the work on the change request meets the business needs of the change requester," at col.77, lines 44-47, therefore, it is clearly said to change requestor for sign-off when the triggering event occurs..)

Blakley and Underwood are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of data processing system and e-commerce database framework..

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of **Blakley** and Underwood before him or her, to modify the offering registration trigger is withdrawn once the user signs off.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to be a sign-off checkbox is checked or unchecked, the current user's ID and the current date may be captured by the Change Tracking tool at col. 77, lines 33-65.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine **Blakley** with Underwood to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Note that claims 20, 23, 28 and 29 recite the same corresponding limitations as set forth in claims 7 and 13 above, thus the claims are rejected accordingly.

Regarding claim 15, which is depends on claim 9, **Blakley** discloses the claim invention as "A method of publishing through a Discovery Service Framework an attribute offering for sharing a user's attribute between a plurality of Service Providers, a Service Provider being regarded as an Attribute Provider hosting the user's attribute for which the attribute offering may be published, the Discovery Service Framework suitable for holding attribute offerings from at least one Attribute Provider, the method comprising the steps of: registering an offering registration trigger in the Discovery Service Framework upon request from the Attribute Provider; the Discovery Service Framework processing the offering registration trigger upon request for an attribute offering received from an Attribute Requestor; requesting the registration of the attribute offering to the Attribute Provider as a result of processing the offering registration trigger; registering in the Discovery Service Framework an attribute offering upon request from an Attribute Provider; and the Discovery Service Framework providing the attribute offering upon request from a Service Provider acting as an Attribute Requestor

for the attribute offering, Paragraph [0087], [0069], [0090], [0093], [0021], [0035], [0090] and [0099] and [0099]; :

Blakley does not appear to explicitly disclose for "the attribute offering, and not the offering registration trigger, is withdrawn upon request from the Attribute Provider where the user signs off."⁸

However, Underwood teaches, "the attribute offering, and not the offering registration trigger, is withdrawn upon request from the Attribute Provider where the user signs off." at col.76, lines 55-61, col.77, lines 33-65, col.312, lines 22-33.

(Underwood teaches, "sign-off serves as a final quality checkpoint that the work on the change request meets the business needs of the change requester," at col.77, lines 44-47, therefore, it is clearly said to change requestor for sign-off when the triggering event occurs..)

Blakley and Underwood are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of data processing system and e-commerce database framework..

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of **Blakley** and Underwood before him or her; to modify the offering registration trigger is withdrawn once the user signs off.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to be a sign-off checkbox is checked or unchecked, the current user's ID and the current date may be captured by the Change Tracking tool at col. 77, lines 33-65.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine **Blakley** with Underwood to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Response to Arguments

Claims 1- 6, 9-12, 14, 16-22, 24-27 and 30-32

8. Applicant's arguments filed June 17, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner respectfully traverses applicants' argument.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Regarding 35 USC § 101, Applicant's response does not overcome the rejections. **Claims 16-32** are rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The "output unit" of the attribute provider does not provide enough information of the hardware. The claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b)

Claims 1- 6, 9-12, 14, 16-22, 24-27 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Blakley, III et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0128378).

Applicant's argument stated, "Blakley does not disclose an Attribute Provider registering an offering registration trigger in the Discovery Service Framework, receiving by the Attribute Provider from the Discovery Service Framework a request for registration of the attribute offering, or registering by the Attribute Provider an attribute offering in the Discovery Service Framework." On the contrary Blakley teaches, "the authentication is successful, an active session is established for the authenticated user or client" at Paragraph [0047] and "framework for exchanging security information" at paragraph [0068] and "the user (40) might have accessed another service provider(30) and, after having been authenticated in this another service provider, the user may invoke a service that, for its complete execution, needs a user's attribute that is hosted in an external Attribute provider (20). The another service provider (30) where the user has presently accessed, playing the role of an Attribute Requestor, requests (S-102) the location of the user's attribute to the DSF (10)" at paragraph [0077], thus in here, the Attribute Provider registration is equivalent to authentication of data which triggers the process for the requested attributes and the attributes are being shared.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 7, 8, 13, 15, 20, 23, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakley et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0128378 A1) as

applied to **claims 1, 9 16 and 24** above, and further in view of Underwood (US Patent No. 6,633,878 B1).

In light of the foregoing arguments the 35 U.S.C. § 101, 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) rejections are hereby sustained.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad N. Rahman whose telephone number is 571-270-1631. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am - 5:00 pm, Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mofiz Apu M can be reached on 572-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

M. Rahman
AU 2161
09/05/2008

/K. B. P./

/Apu M Mofiz/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161

